

A yellow crosshair graphic consisting of a vertical line and a horizontal line intersecting in the upper left corner of the page.

JEWISH FABLES

E. Michael Jones

Jewish Fables

Darwinism, Materialism, and other Jewish Fables

E. Michael Jones

Fidelity Press
206 Marquette Avenue
South Bend, Indiana 46617
www.culturewars.com
www.fidelitypress.org
© E. Michael Jones, 2018



All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of Fidelity Press.

Contents

- 1
Whig Metahistory
- 2
Harari's Ignorance
- 3
The Testimony of Mickey Mouse
- 4
Genesis and Evolution
- 5
The Gorging Gene
- 6
The War on *Logos*
- 7
Biological Determinism
- 8
Truth
- 9
Heaven on Earth
- 10
Super-Oxycontin
- 11
Animal to God

Endnotes

What is cannot come out of what is not.

Parmenides

And I have noticed that most modern history is driven to something like sophistry, first to soften the sharp transition from animals to men. ... Most modern histories of mankind begin with the word evolution, and with a rather wordy exposition of evolution, for much the same reason that operated in this case. There is something slow and soothing and gradual about the word and even about the idea. As a matter of fact, it is not, touching these primary things, a very practical word or a very profitable idea. Nobody can imagine how nothing could turn into something. Nobody can get an inch nearer to it by explaining how something could turn into something else. It is really far more logical to start by saying 'In the beginning God created heaven and earth' even if you only mean 'In the beginning some unthinkable power began some unthinkable process.' ... In other words, every sane sort of history must begin with man as man, a thing standing absolute and alone. How he came there, or indeed how anything else came there, is a thing for theologians and philosophers and scientists and not for historians.

G.K. Chesterton, *The Everlasting Man*

Whig Metahistory

Metahistory is back in style. In 1951, when it was already in decline, Christopher Dawson drew an analogy between metaphysics and metahistory by citing Aristotle, who “proceeded to discuss the ultimate concepts that underlie his physical theories: the nature of matter, the nature of being and the cause of motion and change” after he had written his books on physics. Similarly, “metahistory is concerned with the nature of history, the meaning of history and the cause and significance of historical change.”^[1] Metahistory is a philosophical meditation on the meaning of human history in its entirety which came into being during the Christian era when thinkers like St. Augustine synthesized the Hebrew tradition, which had history but no philosophy, and the Greek tradition which had philosophy but lacked a theory of cosmic history.

Even though he never uses the term metahistory, Yuval Noah Harari, professor of history at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, is a practitioner of this art. Anyone who writes a book which “surveys the entire length of human history, from the evolution of Homo sapiens in the Stone Age up to the political and technological revolutions of the 21st century,” as his *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind* does, should acknowledge thinkers like St. Augustine, because he invented the idea, and more immediate forebears like Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee, but neither metahistorian is mentioned in *Sapiens*. In fact, the term metahistory isn’t mentioned at all, probably because of its association with German idealism and the reputation things German have among Jews.

According to Christopher Dawson, the most recent wave of metahistory came into being in the wake of “the great movement of philosophical idealism which dominated the 19th century.” Its greatest proponent was G.W.F. Hegel. As of the mid-20th century, “the great movement of philosophical idealism that dominated the 19th century” had “come to an end and consequently the idealist interpretations of history have become discredited.”^[2] Historians writing in the mid-20th century were in “revolt

against the metahistory of Hegel and Croce and Collingwood, not because it is metahistorical, but because they feel it to be the expression of a philosophical attitude that is no longer valid; just as the liberal historians of the 18th century revolted against the metahistory of the previous period.”^[3] Although Dawson doesn’t put it this way, the idea of metahistory, like the notion of God upon which it was necessarily based, died at Auschwitz, as Elie Wiesel might have put it. While there have been Jewish Hegelians like Karl Marx and Samuel Hirsch in the past,^[4] they are a rare breed anywhere these days, and certainly much rarer at Israeli universities, where Jews like Harari are busy now resurrecting what they destroyed.

Harari may teach at an Israeli university but the historical school that informs his book is not Jewish in any definable sense. Harari received his DPhil from Jesus College, Oxford under the supervision of Steven J. Gunn. The worldview which informs *Sapiens* is both Jewish and English, but it is English in its own peculiar way. *Sapiens* is what one might call, with apologies to Sir Herbert Butterfield, Whig metahistory, with all of the contradictions that term entails.^[5] Like the English Ideology from the time of Newton, *Sapiens* aspires to erect an intellectual skyscraper on a foundation of philosophical mud. Reading Harari, I was reminded of John Maynard Keynes, who felt that the world of political philosophers “believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences,” but “are usually slaves of some defunct economist.”^[6] Harari is what Keynes would call the slave to some defunct metaphysician.

In order to write the metahistory he aspires to write, Harari needed to learn more about metaphysics than he was evidently able to learn at one of England’s two premier universities, because he begins his book at the absolute beginning of everything, which is by necessity outside of history and just as necessarily within the realm of first philosophy or metaphysics. And how did the “Timeline of History” begin? “Matter and energy appear,” Harari tells us with a straight face. Harari erroneously identifies the beginning of everything with the “beginning of physics,” which got invented by Aristotle in Greece some time later. Reiterating what he already said in a different key, Harari tries to give an account of the beginning once again, telling us this time that at the beginning: “Atoms and molecules appear.” In other words, “shit happens.” Or, as a more forthright historian might have put it: “I don’t know how anything came into being” because Whig metahistory doesn’t

believe in metaphysics. They haven't taught this course at Oxford since the days of William of Ockham. What they now teach there goes by the name of "science," which tells us that:

ABOUT 13.5 BILLION YEARS AGO, MATTER, energy, time and space came into being in what is known as the Big Bang. The story of these fundamental features of our universe is called physics. About 300,000 years after their appearance, matter and energy started to coalesce into complex structures, called atoms, which then combined into molecules. The story of atoms, molecules and their interactions is called chemistry. About 3.8 billion years ago, on a planet called Earth, certain molecules combined to form particularly large and intricate structures called organisms. The story of organisms is called biology. About 70,000 years ago, organisms belonging to the species *Homo sapiens* started to form even more elaborate structures called cultures. The subsequent development of these human cultures is called history.

[7]

There you have it: Whig metahistory in a nutshell. Shit happened, just the way the mural at the Museum of Natural History said it did. Harari makes his first big mistake when he claims that the story of how everything came into being "is called physics." The science of how everything comes into being is called, on the contrary, metaphysics. Physics can only deal with matter and energy once they have come into existence. The fact that Harari doesn't know this dooms his metahistory from the outset. Since Harari is not a physicist, he can't really explain what he thinks he needs to explain. As a result, his history rests uneasily on a shaky foundation of exploded myths and discredited junk "science," which has been abandoned by scientists and is now taught only in high school biology classes, where the children of the deplorables learn scientific "facts" about how "atoms formed," followed by life emerging from a lightning bolt striking a primeval soup of amino acids. This is what Harari could legitimately call a fiction because it derives from the writings of "scientists" like Mary Shelley, who wrote *Frankenstein* based on "facts" culled from people like Galvani, who made frog legs twitch from electric shock, and Erasmus Darwin, Charles' grandfather. Mary Shelley wrote *Frankenstein*, not because of her knowledge of "science," but because she was plagued by guilt for violating what the Enlightenment considers to this day an imaginary moral law.

During phase three of Harari's history of everything, "certain molecules combined to form particularly large and intricate structures called organisms."^[8] In keeping with his understanding of himself as the universal

polymath, Harari calls “the story of organisms” biology when in fact he means to say Darwinism, which is the ideological weaponization of biology. The same metaphysical principles apply here as well. Natural selection, the mechanism at the heart of Darwin’s ideology, can only explain how modification takes place in already existent beings. It cannot explain how those beings—be it a species or an organ like the eye or life itself—came into existence. This is so because biology is no more metaphysics than physics is. “Science,” as we understand the term, can explain how things function once they exist, but it cannot explain how anything comes into existence. Coming into existence is another way of saying creation. Evolution “offers us a scientific account of changes, of how a later state of the material world might have emerged from an earlier state—whereas creation offers us a metaphysical account of where the material world itself ultimately comes from.”^[9] Similarly, natural selection, the philosophical engine which pulls the Darwinian train, can only select traits that already exist. It cannot favor, for example, more acute sight in an organism which is blind. Since everything had to evolve from a “blind amoeba,” according to Christopher Hitchens, sight cannot exist according to the principle of natural selection because at the beginning it had nothing to work on.

As natural selection acts solely by accumulating slight, successive, favourable variations, it can produce no great or sudden modification; it can act only by very short and slow steps. Hence the canon of ‘*Natura non facit saltum*,’ which every fresh addition to our knowledge tends to make more strictly correct, is on this theory simply unintelligible. We can plainly see why nature is prodigal in variety, though niggard in innovation. But why this should be a law of nature if each species has been independently created, no man can explain.^[10]

Let’s then deal with the beginning according to Whig metahistory, one preposterous claim at a time. The most preposterous claim of all, of course, is, as Harari puts it, the claim that “Atoms and molecules appear.” How exactly did this happen? If Harari knows, he isn’t telling. If he doesn’t know, then he has no business making the claim. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, we must assume, therefore, not only that Harari began his book with a horrendous philosophical blunder but that, blinded by Whig metahistory, he was unaware that he had made it.

So let’s help him out by explaining what he needs to know. We know that something exists. We also know that nothing can come from nothing. Was there nothing before the first atom appeared? If so, then the first atom

could not have appeared because nothing can come from nothing. It is obvious that there is now a whole universe of impressive somethings, so there was never nothing. This something could not bring itself into existence because in order to do that, it would have to exist before it existed, which is impossible. Therefore, something else had to bring it into existence, and that something is what all men call God. This means that anyone who aspires to write a metahistory of the scope of *Sapiens*, which begins with the appearance of the first atom, will of necessity have to talk about creation and God because the universe could not create itself. The fact that the universe exists means that God is necessarily the creator of the universe. The universe had to have a cause, even if the universe is eternal, which no one believes anymore. The universe could not exist unless something created it.

Needless to say, this is not how Professor Harari begins his book. Harari's mind is the slave of a defunct biologist by the name of Charles Darwin. Because there is no creator, Harari must of necessity believe in a myth that is totally preposterous, namely, that shit just happened. There is no way to prove this assertion. Harari simply asserts the claim in an aggressive—dare we say Jewish—way, substituting *chutzpah* for reasoned argument.

Harari's Darwinism, in other words, has blinded him to an understanding of how things come into being. Because he is incapable of understanding the most rudimentary metaphysical principles, Harari fails to see that any real beginning is a form of creation and that, therefore, the only rational explanation of any real beginning necessarily involves the existence of God. Harari becomes, therefore, an atheist by default. Harari's atheism, as a result, commits him to a view of the universe and history which is fundamentally irrational—as irrational as the statement “atoms formed”—and which dooms his metahistorical project from the start. Because Whig metahistory is a contradiction in terms, *Sapiens* isn't really history at all. It is the Jewish take on English “science,” which began as magic under the direction of John Dee and then, thanks to Isaac Newton, became a materialistic ideology which has been full of contradictions for centuries. Harari's materialism flows naturally from his atheism with the same blindness as its consequence.

Harari's materialism turns the world upside down. The things he considers real are fictions, and the things he considers fictions are real. According to Professor Harari's view of the universe, “atoms”—which at the time of Democritus and Leucippus were the fundamental building blocks of

everything else but which have since that time dissolved into a bottomless morass of subatomic particles—are real, but justice is not. Justice is a “fiction.” Tacitly admitting the incoherence of his book, Harari tries to float “fictions” as the missing link which connects cognition, which is by definition immaterial, with biological materialism:

How did Homo sapiens manage to cross this critical threshold, eventually founding cities comprising tens of thousands of inhabitants and empires ruling hundreds of millions? The secret was probably the appearance of fiction. Large numbers of strangers can cooperate successfully by believing in common myths. Any large-scale human cooperation whether a modern state, a medieval church, an ancient city or an archaic tribe—is rooted in common myths that exist only in people’s collective imagination. Churches are rooted in common religious myths. Two Catholics who have never met can nevertheless go together on crusade or pool funds to build a hospital because they both believe that God was incarnated in human flesh and allowed Himself to be crucified to redeem our sins.^[11]

Until those deluded Catholics bumped into Professor Harari, they failed to understand that “none of these things exists outside the stories that people invent and tell one another. There are no gods in the universe, no nations, no money, no human rights, no laws, and no justice outside the common imagination of human beings.”^[12] In Professor Harari’s universe we have “On the one hand, the objective reality of rivers, trees and lions; and on the other hand, the imagined reality of gods, nations and corporations.”^[13] Professor Harari makes this statement blithely unaware of the philosophical problems which follow in its wake. If, for example, only physical things are real, what are we to say about the idea that “only physical things are real”? Is that idea “real” or, better, true? If it is true, then it refutes itself. What about “biology”? Is that real? What about “natural selection”? Is that real? It’s not something that I can touch.

Is Professor Harari’s idea that only physical things are real itself real? Or is it a “fiction” like the Catholic belief “that God was incarnated in human flesh and allowed Himself to be crucified to redeem our sins”?^[14] Either Professor Harari is saying that his ideas are real, but that the ideas of other people are not, or he is saying that all ideas are unreal, including the idea that all ideas are unreal. Either way, his claim is problematic. Is *Sapiens* a work of fiction or is it, as he claims, a “history of humankind” that is to be accepted as rooted in factual, “scientific” claims to be both real and true? Which is it,

Professor? How is it that your “fictions” are true and everyone else’s false?

Harari's Ignorance

How is it that Professor Harari's "fictions" are true and everyone else's "fictions" are false?

Once again, the only plausible explanation is Professor Harari's ignorance. Harari is unaware that his materialism is self-contradictory. This is something that Harari could have learned at Jesus College because the paradox of materialism was formulated by both J.B.S. Haldane, who studied at Oxford, and C.S. Lewis, who used to teach at Cambridge. As they put it, "If my mental processes are determined wholly by the motions of atoms in my brain, I have no reason to suppose that my beliefs are true ... and hence I have no reason for supposing my brain to be composed of atoms."^[15]

If, as he seems to believe, history is nothing more than the description of the motion of atoms in the brain, Harari could have written a much shorter book and spared us the effort of slogging through his 400-page tome. Tacitly recognizing this fact, Harari changes philosophical horses in mid-stream, abandons his materialism without telling us, and claims that human history began with something he calls the "Cognitive Revolution."^[16] From this point onward,

historical narratives replace biological theories as our primary means of explaining the development of Homo sapiens. To understand the rise of Christianity or the French Revolution, it is not enough to comprehend the interaction of genes, hormones and organisms. It is necessary to take into account the interaction of ideas, images and fantasies as well.^[17]

If this is the case, then Harari's case for materialism, along with its foundations in Darwinism, collapses because the "Cognitive Revolution" must be based on cognition, which is another word for mind or reason, which means that materialism is no longer true. But it turns out Harari doesn't believe in cognition either. Later in his book, Harari remounts the materialist horse he previously abandoned and, in a gloss on the American Declaration of Independence, informs us that:

Just as people were never created, neither, according to the science of biology, is there a 'Creator' who 'endows' them with anything. There is only a blind

evolutionary process, devoid of any purpose, leading to the birth of individuals. 'Endowed by their creator' should be translated simply into 'born'. Equally, there are no such things as rights in biology. There are only organs, abilities and characteristics.^[18]

Certain political consequences flow from Harari's atheism. To begin with, "liberty" does not exist because "there is no such thing in biology. ... liberty is something that people invented and that exists only in their imagination."^[19] Well, the automobile is also something that "people invented," does that mean that traffic jams exist only in the imagination? Is the social order like "liberty" or is it like the automobile? Or should I say "automobile"? Harari tries to evade the contradictory conclusions his premises demand by claiming that "We believe in a particular order not because it is objectively true, but because believing in it enables us to cooperate effectively and forge a better society."^[20]

Harari's use of the word "we" reminds one of the joke about Tonto and the Lone Ranger, whose punch line is: "What you mean 'we,' paleface?" Who, in other words, gets to determine whether believing in a particular "imagined order" really "enables us to cooperate effectively and forge a better society"? If there is nothing "objectively true" about that order, it will get chosen because some people like it. If the people who like it have political power they will impose this "imagined order" on the rest of us. If "the social order" has no basis in nature, its only other possible source is human will, but not just any human will. In the absence of a moral order based on the logical structure of the universe, the only possible alternative social order is the one in which the powerful get to impose their will on the weak, and this is precisely the order which Harari is proposing. And if the people who don't like it lack power, that order will get imposed on them whether they like it or not. So, in the final analysis, Harari's philosophy comes down to might makes right. If justice is just a "fiction," then truth, or what is "scientific" or "real," is the opinion of the powerful.

As I said, certain political consequences flow from Harari's description of the universe. The first is that there is no such thing as a natural social order. The only things that qualify as "natural" are derived from physics or biology, as interpreted by intellectual commissars like Professor Harari. Anything else is a human construct or "fiction" which gets imposed on "nature," which can refer to the physical order or, in this instance, other men.

So the social order is an “imagined order,” which is to say, imagined by some people and then imposed on others. This order is “always in danger of collapse because it depends upon myths, and myths vanish once people stop believing in them. In order to safeguard an imagined order, continuous and strenuous efforts are imperative. Some of these efforts take the shape of violence and coercion.”^[21]

So, oddly enough, the “universe,” according to Professor Harari, ends up looking a lot like the Israeli occupation of Palestine, which is based on theft and injustice. The Israelis, who impose this order with “violence and coercion,” needn’t feel guilty because in the big scheme of things there is no such thing as justice:

Hammurabi and the American Founding Fathers alike imagined a reality governed by universal and immutable principles of justice, such as equality or hierarchy. Yet the only place where such universal principles exist is in the fertile imagination of Sapiens, and in the myths they invent and tell one another. These principles have no objective validity.^[22]

Harari’s claim that universal principles have no “objective validity” is objectively and demonstrably false. The fact that no one has ever touched a circle—something which does not exist in nature, as Harari defines that term—does not mean that we cannot make objective and true statements about the radius and circumference of every possible circle. But Harari quite rightly goes on to say that ideas like “justice” and “equality” are “inextricably intertwined with the idea of creation.”^[23] Harari can only base his claim that there is no such thing as “justice” on the previous claim that there is no such thing as God, which is an irrational statement first of all because it is impossible to prove a negative, and secondly because it is possible to prove the existence of God. Because the existence of an orderly universe necessarily implies the existence of a creator God as the source of that order, the social order by which man orders his existence is the logical corollary of the order of that universe. Harari willfully ignores all this in claiming that Darwinism has proven there is no God as the basis for his claim there can be no such thing as “justice.” With an airy wave of the hand, our Jewish professor dismisses any possible just social order as well by linking it to “Christian myths about God”:

The Americans got the idea of equality from Christianity, which argues that every person has a divinely created soul, and that all souls are equal before God. However, if we do not believe in the Christian myths about God, creation and

souls, what does it mean that all people are ‘equal’? Evolution is based on difference, not on equality. Every person carries a somewhat different genetic code, and is exposed from birth to different environmental influences. This leads to the development of different qualities that carry with them different chances of survival. ‘Created equal’ should therefore be translated into ‘evolved differently’.^[24]

Notice how Harari frames the issue in order to arrive at his justification for an unjust social order. Ignoring the fact that God’s existence is a matter of reason, not of faith, Harari turns the tables on those who are rational by claiming that creation is based on “Christian myths about God.” The existence of God is, thereby, removed from the realm of reason and placed within the realm of faith, which is *ipso facto* the realm of the irrational. How could anyone expect a Jew to believe in Christian myths? How can anyone expect a Christian to believe in them if they are myths? Harari then proposes something fundamentally irrational, namely, atheism as the essence of rationality. The world has been turned upside down in one more instance of what I have characterized elsewhere as the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit, which began when the Jews crucified the *logos* incarnate. That event inaugurated the Jewish war on *logos* which has perdured to our day and which finds expression in Professor Harari’s book.

Therefore, it should come as no surprise that Harari’s book is one long attack on language, speech, and rationality, all of which are subsumed under the Greek word *logos*. Speech, it turns out, is the main characteristic that distinguishes man from animals. The ancient Greeks understood that man was different from all other animals because he could speak. The word they used for rationality was “*logos*,” which is also the word for speech, discourse, language, and other related concepts. *Logos* is “the word or that by which the inward thought is expressed”; it is equivalent to the Latin words “*ratio*,” “*vox*,” and “*oratio*,” or “that which is said or spoken.” It is frequently translated as “word,” “language,” or “talk,” as in a saying, or statement, or maxim, or resolution. It can also be translated as speech, discourse, or conversation, as well as the power to speak. From these more basic ideas flows the idea of rationality itself. *Logos* means both thought and reason. When Democritus says that something is “*kata logon*,” he means that it is “agreeable to reason.” *Logos* becomes, therefore, the distinguishing feature of a human being. “*En Andros logo einai*” means “to be reckoned as a man.” “*Ho Logos*” comprises both the sense of thought and word when it is used in

the New Testament.^[25] After meditating on the by then thousand-year-old concept of *logos*, the medieval scholastic successors to the Greek philosophers coined the term “rational animal” (*animale rationale*) as the essential definition of man. Unlike angels, man had a body similar to the bodies of other animals. His distinguishing characteristic, however, was the fact that he could speak and reason, terms subsumed under the Greek term *logos*.

Given the Jewish revolutionaries’ relationship to *logos*, it comes as no surprise that Harari’s book is a protracted attack on all of the concepts the Greeks associated with that word. Materialists believe that consciousness is an *ignis fatuus* which flutters over a swamp of stuff called atoms or matter or whatever. Given that “fact,” human beings get demoted from being a “rational animal” to, as Harari puts it “an animal of no significance.” In stating his thesis, however, Harari immediately contradicts himself:

There was nothing special about humans. Nobody, least of all humans themselves, had any inkling that their descendants would one day walk on the moon, split the atom, fathom the genetic code and write history books. The most important thing to know about prehistoric humans is that they were insignificant animals with no more impact on their environment than gorillas, fireflies or jellyfish.^[26]

If, the perceptive reader might ask, there is “nothing special about humans,” how did they accomplish all of the things Harari just mentioned? Harari claims that “people were outraged” when Charles Darwin claimed that homo sapiens “was just another kind of animal.” He then proceeds to give the Jewish *reductio ad absurdum* of Darwin’s already absurd idea, by claiming that, “like it or not,” we are “members of a noisy family called the great apes,” whose nearest relatives are chimpanzees. In fact, “Just 6 million years ago, a single female ape had two daughters. One became the ancestor of all chimpanzees, the other is our own grandmother.”^[27]

Harari, it seems, can’t expunge the Book of Genesis from his mind, perhaps because its central assertion about the human race, namely, that all humans have descended from one man and one woman, has been validated by the genome project. Harari’s “Cognitive Revolution” corresponds in time with the emergence of Chromosomal Adam and Mitochondrial Eve:

In 1987, after some calculations, it was concluded that “Ychromosomal Adam” lived about 60,000-90,000 years ago in Africa. The date is rather approximate, since such calculations are not very exact because of some uncertainty about

mutation rates. In a similar way, everyone alive today can also be linked back to “mitochondrial Eve.” She must have lived about 140,000-120,000 years ago. But as usual in science, things keep updating. Recently, the difference in years has been estimated for “Adam” between 120,000 and 156,000 years ago, and for “Eve” between 99,000 and 148,000 years ago.^[28]

It turns out that human language, what Harari calls the “Cognitive Revolution,” and the two humans from whom all other humans descended apparently emerged at around the same time. The coincidence puts Professor Harari in a bind. If there is no real difference between humans and chimpanzees, how can Harari say that, “Homo sapiens conquered the world thanks above all to its unique language.”^[29] If homo sapiens has a “unique language,” how can Harari claim that he is “just another kind of animal”?

Harari never resolves this contradiction. He makes both contradictory claims throughout his book. If homo sapiens has a unique language, then he is not “just another kind of animal.” He is completely unique. The same is true of his uniqueness *vis-a-vis* any other hominid, like Neanderthal Man, which Harari proposes as the intermediary step between apes and man. Abandoning his materialism in the light of irrefutable evidence surrounding man’s ability to speak, Harari identifies this turning point in history as “the Cognitive Revolution”:

The appearance of new ways of thinking and communicating, between 70,000 and 30,000 years ago, constitutes the Cognitive Revolution. What caused it? We’re not sure. The most commonly believed theory argues that accidental genetic mutations changed the inner wiring of the brains of Sapiens, enabling them to think in unprecedented ways and to communicate using an altogether new type of language. We might call it the Tree of Knowledge mutation. Why did it occur in Sapiens DNA rather than in that of Neanderthals? It was a matter of pure chance, as far as we can tell.^[30]

Harari attempts to have his cake and eat it too when he claims that language makes man unique among all of the other animals on earth, because “genetic mutations changed the inner wiring of the brains of Sapiens.” First of all, how does he know this is true? He is stating as true something for which there is no evidence. He has simply extrapolated the claim from the premises of Darwinism. Leaving aside the cause for a moment, we are still confronted with a problem. If, as Harari claims, all humans had a common ancestor, one which he identifies as a chimpanzee, how did the Cognitive Revolution take place? Did a monkey suddenly start talking? If so, to whom? To another monkey? If what he calls “the Tree of Knowledge mutation” took

place in just one monkey, that monkey would have no one else to talk to. No communication would be possible because humans can talk but monkeys can't.

The linguist Noam Chomsky, who does not believe that animals are capable of human speech, agrees that the transition to human language was sudden: "It looks as if—given the time involved—there was a sudden 'great leap forward.'"^[31] Like Harari, however, Chomsky feels that the cause was "some small genetic modification" which "somehow ... rewired the brain slightly [and] made this human capacity [for language] available."

Like Harari, Chomsky is intellectually crippled by his adherence to the claims of defunct biologists. Because he limits the cause to genetic mutation, Chomsky is forced to conclude that the advent of human language "had to have happened in a single person" without evidently thinking through the consequences of that claim. If human language came about through genetic modification, the same fully formed language would have to appear simultaneously and by chance in the minds of two human beings living in close enough proximity that these two humans could speak to each other, something which is so improbable that it is virtually impossible. If the Cognitive Revolution is another term for the emergence of speech, and if the defining characteristic of man, even according to Harari, is his ability to speak, then man had to emerge full-blown as *homo sapiens* from the moment he began to speak, at the time of what Harari calls "the Cognitive Revolution."

Beyond that, *homo sapiens* had to emerge as a pair of human beings who could speak to each other simply because of the exigencies of language. If there is only one man, communication is not only unnecessary; it is impossible because it is not communication. Communication requires two human beings and a language that allows them to communicate effectively immediately. Language can grow in vocabulary and sophistication once it exists, but it cannot evolve from something that it is not. Evolution, in other words, can play no role in the Cognitive Revolution. It's an all or nothing proposition which necessitates creation as its cause because all of the parts—man, rationality, and speech—had to come into existence out of nothing simultaneously in order to function.

One term is a function of the other. An ape which can speak is by definition a man. A man can either speak or he cannot speak. He cannot

speak by himself. Language involves not only speaking but understanding as well. It involves, of necessity, a speaker and a listener. Because of that, man's language had to come into existence full-blown in two humans at the same moment in time. The moment one man spoke to another man in a human language he ceased to be anything other than a man.

This fact gives new meaning to the first sentence of The Gospel of St. John: "In the beginning was the Word." *En arche een ho Logos*. The human race began, in other words, when one man spoke the first word to another man, or as the author of Genesis would say, to another man who happened to be a woman. The fact that we have all grown accustomed to cave man stories, Mickey Mouse cartoons, and the opening scenes of *2001: A Space Odyssey* does not change the fact that only humans can speak and that they can only speak to each other and that in order to do that they must share a common language from the moment they begin to communicate, a moment which is co-terminus with their existence as human beings.

After finally making some progress in explaining why human beings are unique, Harari returns like a dog to the vomit of materialism and takes it all back by claiming that there is nothing special about language because "every animal has some kind of language."^[32] "Even insects," we are told, "know how to communicate in sophisticated ways."^[33] It's difficult to infer what Harari means by "sophisticated," especially since he immediately contradicts himself when he describes "our language" as something that can "produce an infinite number of sentences, each with a distinct meaning," something which distinguishes it from the language of insects, who know how to inform "one another of the whereabouts of food" and the language of a green monkey, which "can yell to its comrades, 'Careful! A lion!'" Unlike both of these animals, "a modern human can tell her friends that this morning, near the bend in the river, she saw a lion tracking a herd of bison."^[34]

Harari gets away with contradictions like this by using verbal sleights of hand based on the equivocation of crucial terms. His use of the term "language," for example, is completely equivocal. In fact, his entire argument is reducible to the equivocal use of one term—namely, "language"—to describe two completely different forms of communication. Animals can communicate by barking, chirping, growling, hissing, etc., but only man "can connect a limited number of sounds and signs to produce an infinite number of sentences, each with a distinct meaning."^[35] Language is, therefore, proof

that man is unique, which is precisely what Harari denies when he describes him as an ape.

Apes, we know from experience, can communicate, but they do not talk. Anyone who has had children and a dog as a pet understands this. Dogs bark and wag their tails from almost the moment they are born but never progress beyond this form of communication, either with their masters or each other. Children begin their lives as communicators on roughly the same level as the family dog by smiling or crying, but by the time they are around a year old they begin speaking words and within the next year of their lives begin speaking in sentences. Children pick up their native language effortlessly from their mothers, which is why the Germans refer to it as their “*Muttersprache*.” Children, in other words, have a natural aptitude for something that non-rational animals can’t learn at all, in spite of some species’ ability to mimic sounds.

Everyone knows this, but the Darwinian insistence that humans were only different from animals in degree rather than kind led to various campaigns to teach animals to talk. The simple fact that a laborious campaign needed to be mounted to bring about what happened effortlessly among children was studiously ignored. Since the great apes resembled humans most closely in physical appearance, they became the preferred candidate, even though parrots had more suitable vocal chords.

After years of failure in their attempt to teach nonhuman primates to imitate human speech, two cognitive researchers, R. Allen Gardner and Beatrix T. Gardner, came up with the brilliant idea of teaching American Sign Language to Washoe, 10-month old chimp they had rescued from military scientists. Ignoring the fact that sign language was speech only by analogy and that it was made up of gestures that were intrinsically ambiguous, the Gardners soon convinced themselves that Washoe was communicating with them in a way that was “reliably understandable.”^[36]

Three years later, the Gardners issued a report on Washoe’s progress which indicated that the speech barrier separating humans and animals had finally been broken. Duane Rumbaugh, scientist emeritus at the Great Ape Trust of Iowa, described the Gardners’ success in teaching Washoe how to “talk” as “absolutely frontier-breaking work.” Inspired by the reception of their study, the Gardners soon had Washoe not only “speaking” *via* sign language but also writing poetry. After seeing a swan, Washoe signed

“water” and then “bird,” something which Harvard psychologist Roger Brown described as “like getting an SOS from outer space.” Washoe’s “poetry” inspired other cognitive researchers from around the world to teach their monkeys how to speak.

Then in the late 1970s, the excitement died down after other cognitive researchers failed to replicate the results of the Gardners’ experiment. When Columbia professor Herbert Terrace showed that what the Gardners thought was speech was merely imitation in anticipation of reward, the enthusiasm that characterized the early phase of the talking monkey craze collapsed into embarrassed silence. Washoe’s eloquence was in reality nothing more than a manifestation of the same stimulus-response mechanism that men had used to train dogs and other domestic animals from time immemorial. After viewing videos of various chimp-human interactions, including those of Washoe with the Gardners, Terrace concluded that “there was no spontaneity, no real use of grammar” of the sort that characterized human speech. Washoe’s “conversations” with the Gardners consisted of roughly 130 signs which the monkey learned in reaction to prompts from her trainers. Washoe, in other words, made the sign language gestures the Gardners wanted not because she had anything to say or because she understood what the Gardners said, but in anticipation of a reward. She was “not engaging in anything like human conversation.”^[37]

The excitement surrounding Washoe had more to do with Darwinism’s unfulfilled hopes than any real ability of human speech to jump downward over the species barrier which separated humans from animals. Cognitive research was committed to materialism, atheism, and Darwinism. Getting a monkey to talk was important to maintaining that worldview because Darwinism assumed that there are “no discontinuities but just ongoing and gradual continuity, with small incremental steps”^[38] between apes and humans. The Gardners and other cognitive researchers wanted Washoe to talk because they, like Harari, were deeply committed to Darwin’s proposition that “the difference in mind between man and higher animals, great as it is, certainly is one of degree and not of kind.”^[39]

The Testimony of Mickey Mouse

In spite of the testimony of Mickey Mouse, there is no possible evolutionary link between a mouse's squeak and a man's speech. They exist on fundamentally different ontological planes, even though both are forms of communication. Hamlet and Shakespeare are certainly related, but Hamlet cannot become Shakespeare, or *vice versa*, because they inhabit different planes of being. "The doctrine of gradualism basically denies that there is any clear transition point from pre-human to human,"^[40] but the existence of language among humans constitutes a clear refutation of that idea.

Genetic, physiological, and anatomical features are not the determining factors for being human. Although we do breed, feed, bleed, and excrete like they do—yes, we are connected all the way down—what does in fact set us apart from the animal world is something not necessarily of a biological nature, namely our faculties of language, rationality, morality, self-expression, and religion.^[41]

Taken together this is what the Greeks referred to as *logos*. The Scholastics referred to man as the *animal rationale* in recognition of the fact that he is the only animal that possessed these qualities. There is no evidence that human language evolved gradually from animal communication. Both are what they are. Neither can derive from the other. After years of fruitless attempts to teach monkeys how to talk, the evolutionary linguists were forced to conclude "that the emergence of human language" is "an embarrassment for evolutionary theory."^[42] What the Dutch geneticist Gerard Verschuuren considers the fossil evidence for human speech, a piece of ochre with a crosshatch design carved in it which was found in the Blombos Cave in South Africa, indicates that language emerged "quite suddenly"^[43] some 80,000 ago, a period that corresponds roughly to Harari's "Cognitive Revolution" and the emergence of Y-Chromosomal "Adam."

Once again, the existence of language confounds those who seek its cause in lower forms of life, forcing Verschuuren to conclude that "The power of using language and the power of conceptual understanding are both uniquely human, and therefore cannot be inherited from the animal

world.”^[44] Man’s capacity for *logos* and all of its activities eventually became associated with *psyche* or the soul, which, after a long and complicated debate, Aristotle defined as the form or *eidos* of the body. Aristotle got the term from Plato his teacher but refined it from being a pre-existing ghost in a machine into a function of man’s activity, which was an expression of his essential being. Arguing by analogy, Aristotle said that if the body were an axe its soul would be chopping. Similarly, if the body were an eye, its soul would be seeing, something he defined as its first act, which is similar to our concept of purpose. In other words,

That which makes a person a human being is a human soul. So how and when did the human soul emerge? Since a soul does not admit of degrees—you either have one or you don’t—in our ancestry there must have been a first creature, or set of creatures, endowed with an immortal human soul and the mental powers of language, rationality, morality, self-awareness, and religion. You either have those faculties or you don’t. They don’t come in degrees either.^[45]

The human race began when the first man spoke the first word, which he probably spoke to the God who created him by endowing him with the soul which allowed him to speak before he spoke to a fellow human being. Such a moment does not admit of gradualist explanations. Then as now, animals can either speak or they cannot. Those who can are known, *ipso facto*, as human beings. In order to continue in existence, the human race needed to be sexually differentiated, which required the creation of another rational creature, just like first one, who differed in gender. In the Genesis account of creation, man preceded woman. At this point man could talk to woman in the same way that man had previously talked to God, his Creator, because what God and man shared was *logos*, which he shared in a unique way which separated him from the same *logos* which was the operating system for all of creation.

Verschuuren attempts to reconcile the Genesis account and the fossil record by claiming that the “‘preparatory work,’ had to be done gradually” as part of “a biological process.”^[46] This gradual biological process was then followed by a “spiritual process,” in which God chose to raise two members of a population of “anatomically modern humans” to the spiritual level of language, rationality, morality, self-awareness, and religion. Pope John Paul II spoke of “an ontological leap,”^[47] which corresponds in time with Harari’s “Cognitive Revolution.” Verschuuren claims that “the human faculties of

language, rationality, morality, self-awareness, and religion emerged” both simultaneously and suddenly “somewhere in Africa some 80,000 years ago”^[48] as part of an event which was by definition spiritual and, therefore, “beyond the scope of science.”^[49]

Genesis and Evolution

Verschuuren's attempt to reconcile Genesis and evolution leads him, unfortunately, into a Platonic dualism which allows a previously existent spiritual soul to inhabit a previously existing biological body, when he tells us that "the bodies of human creatures must have been apt to receive a human soul, which includes the right genes and the proper brains."^[50] If the soul is the form of the body, it is difficult to understand how a body could exist without its form. Plato felt that a pre-existent soul inhabited a material body in the same manner in which a pilot was "in" a ship. If the soul is its form, the body is not an empty vessel waiting to be filled by a soul, in the sense that a car sits fully formed in the drive-way waiting for a driver. The human body is an expression of the human soul; it had to be created with that expression in mind. It could not exist apart from its existence as the material expression of the soul's first act of rationality, speech, etc. The idea that at some point in time there were physical human beings with animal souls is simply untenable and flies in the face of any sophisticated understanding of what the soul is and how it acts. The first man's body, therefore, had to be a special act of creation every bit as much as the creation of the first man's soul was because, according to Aristotle's more sophisticated understanding of their relationship, neither soul nor body can exist independently of the other.

Either way, science cannot document the emergence of man. The first man may have resembled other hominids at this time even more closely than we resemble apes in our day, but both his body and soul were of a fundamentally different nature and could only have come into being as a special act of creation, which will remain forever undocumentable to science. Pope John Paul II claimed that "The moment of passage into the spiritual realm is not something that can be observed with research in the fields of physics and chemistry."^[51] His immediate successor made that moment even less accessible to science by identifying it with the first word of human speech. Like St. John the Evangelist, Pope Benedict XVI believes that the beginning of mankind was identical with man's utterance of the first word:

The clay became man at the moment in which a being for the first time was capable of forming, however dimly, the thought of ‘God’. The first Thou that—however stammeringly—was said by human lips to God marks the moment in which the spirit arose in the world. Here the Rubicon of anthropogenesis was crossed. For it is not the use of weapons or fire, not new methods of cruelty or of useful activity, that constitute man, but rather his ability to be immediately in relation to God. This holds fast to the doctrine of the special creation of man ... herein ... lies the reason why the moment of anthropogenesis cannot possibly be determined by paleontology: anthropogenesis is the rise of the spirit, which cannot be excavated with a shovel.^[52]

Certain things follow from this conclusion. First of all, there is no such thing as history without *logos*. In order to write his history, Harari must periodically abandon his materialism because, as even he has figured out, animals do not have histories because they do not have reason. The lives of dogs do not combine to create a history that spans centuries or millennia, which is the scope of *Sapiens*. The lives of dogs do nothing more than recapitulate each other in the opposite direction until they finally collapse into one life which recapitulates the life of the species. Man is the only creature on this earth which has a history because he is the only creature on this earth that is rational. Rationality allows man to discern patterns in the changing flux of temporal events; it also allows him to discuss these patterns with other men, and eventually to write them down so that future generations of rational creatures can discuss them as well. There can be, therefore, no history without rationality.

To get around the contradictory and equivocal nature of his understanding of language, Harari creates the idea of “fictions,” which involve “the ability to transmit information about things that do not exist at all.”^[53] The ability to speak about things which do not exist “is the most unique feature of *Sapiens* language.”^[54]

The Gorging Gene

One of Harari's "fictions," which involves "the ability to transmit information about things which do not exist at all," is morality. Just as Darwinism tries to obscure the boundary separating animal communication from human speech, it also tries to come up with a materialistic explanation of morality by reducing it to a function of genetics. Like Professor Dawkins, who believes in a "selfish gene," Harari believes that a "widely accepted" "gorging gene," rather than an inability to impose rational or moral control over appetite, is the cause of obesity. People are fat because "The instinct to gorge on high-calorie food was hard-wired into our genes. ... That's what makes some of us spoon down an entire tub of Ben & Jerry's when we find one in the freezer and wash it down with a jumbo Coke."^[55]

Since the "instinct to gorge on high-calorie food" is "hard-wired into our genes," the next question should be "Why isn't everybody fat?" If we are all biologically programmed to gorge ourselves, why is it that some people eat moderately and some people do not? Why is it that some people are thin and fit and other people are morbidly obese? Does moderation, which is to say, rational control over appetite, have something to do with this? According to Harari, "moderation" or the virtue of temperance qualifies unambiguously as a "fiction," which is another word for unreal, whereas the "gorging gene" is just as unambiguously a "scientific" fact which is "widely accepted."

Not surprisingly, the same inability to subject appetite to rational control extends to human sexuality. "Evolutionary psychologists," we are told,

argue that ancient foraging bands were not composed of nuclear families centred on monogamous couples. Rather, foragers lived in communes devoid of private property, monogamous relationships and even fatherhood. In such a band, a woman could have sex and form intimate bonds with several men (and women) simultaneously, and all of the band's adults cooperated in parenting its children. Since no man knew definitively which of the children were his, men showed equal concern for all youngsters. Such a social structure is not an Aquarian utopia. It's well documented among animals, notably our closest relatives, the chimpanzees and bonobos.^[56]

How do we know that the first humans were promiscuous? Well, because monkeys are. But humans are different from monkeys, aren't they? No, of course not. Just look at how ancient foraging bands behaved. This is proof that they behaved just like monkeys. The perceptive reader may have noticed a certain circularity in this argument. Neither the fossil record nor archeology provides any evidence for Harari's theory of human sexuality. Why then does Professor Harari believe that it's true? Well, because "it's well documented among animals." If animals are different from humans, however, the argument immediately collapses.

Harari could, of course, point to the sexual mores of primitive peoples as indicative of how the first humans behaved. In fact, he seems to have consulted anthropologists like Margaret Mead at some point before making his claim that:

A good mother will make a point of having sex with several different men, especially when she is pregnant, so that her child will enjoy the qualities (and paternal care) not merely of the best hunter, but also of the best storyteller, the strongest warrior and the most considerate lover. If this sounds silly, bear in mind that before the development of modern embryological studies, people had no solid evidence that babies are always sired by a single father rather than by many.^[57]

Well, as a matter of fact, this does sound silly. For once, we find ourselves in complete agreement with Professor Harari. Depending on how he defines the term, modern embryological studies began either in 1827, with the germ layer theory of embryonic development, or the 1950s, with the discovery of the helical structure of DNA.^[58] If people living before either date were unaware that babies "are always sired by a single father," how does Harari the historian explain things like primogeniture, inheritance laws, and the stigma of illegitimacy? Is Professor Harari familiar with the Hebrew term "*mamzer*"? It appears in both Deuteronomy and the Talmud, which means that for somewhere between two and three millennia Jews knew that a child was sired by one father, who was either married to the mother or not. If the child was sired outside of marriage, he was known as a "*mamzer*" or a bastard, and certain legal consequences followed from what was clearly seen as a violation of the moral law. You would think that a professor at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem would know things like that.

Preposterous claims like this lead the perceptive reader to wonder about the sources for the professor's theories. Do "evolutionary psychologists"

have some mystical insight into the sex lives of the cave men? Or is Professor Harari talking about something closer to home when he tells us that

the frequent infidelities that characterise modern marriages, and the high rates of divorce, not to mention the cornucopia of psychological complexes from which both children and adults suffer, all result from forcing humans to live in nuclear families and monogamous relationships that are incompatible with our biological software.^[59]

The best aid in understanding passages like this derives from Harari's theory of language. "Our language," he tells us, "evolved as a way of gossiping."^[60] This means that it wasn't "enough for individual men and women to know the whereabouts of lions and bison. It's much more important for them to know who in their band hates whom, who is sleeping with whom, who is honest, and who is a cheat."^[61]

Confirming the thought that immediately popped into my mind, Professor Harari writes:

The gossip theory might sound like a joke, but numerous [albeit uncited] studies support it. Even today the vast majority of human communication—whether in the form of emails, phone calls or newspaper columns—is gossip. It comes so naturally to us that it seems as if our language evolved for this very purpose. Do you think that history professors chat about the reasons for World War One when they meet for lunch, or that nuclear physicists spend their coffee breaks at scientific conferences talking about quarks? Sometimes. But more often, they gossip about the professor who caught her husband cheating.^[62]

So making use of the hermeneutic which Professor Harari himself provides, we are forced to conclude that when he purports to talk about the sexual mores of cave men, Harari is in reality talking about the sexual behavior of the history faculty at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and—dare we say it?—about himself. Our suspicions are confirmed by Harari's Wikipedia entry, which announces that he is "openly gay."^[63]

The War on *Logos*

The school of disguised autobiographical anthropology has a long, if not venerable, history. Margaret Mead achieved fame as an anthropologist by projecting her adulterous relationship with Edward Sapir onto the unsuspecting natives of Samoa.^[64] Sigmund Freud, who once claimed that “all men” desired to have sexual relations with their mothers or sisters, purported to find the “Oedipus Complex” after years of scientific investigation. Subsequent research has shown [if Harari can routinely make claims like this, why can’t I?] that its real source was the adulterous affair he had with his sister-in-law Minna Bernays.^[65] Freud went to his grave hating the Rev. Wilhelm Schmidt, SVD, because Schmidt exposed *Totem and Taboo*, Freud’s foray into anthropology, as equally baseless. One of the most notorious fictions of English intellectual history is the “state of nature,” which Hobbes described as “nasty, brutish, and short.” If Hobbes can project the English religious wars of the 17th century back onto the first humans, why can’t Professor Harari do the same thing with the catty, gossiping homosexual professors at Hebrew University as his model?

The answer to this question is not only that he can but that he does. It’s all part of the war he wages on *logos*. There is no “science” here, but there is lots of projection. “Science” is another word for the Jewish hatred of *logos*, which takes on new ferocity when combined with the homosexual’s rage against nature. By combining these two identities, Harari becomes what Bryan Singer, who is also a Jew and a homosexual, called a “mutant” in his X-men movies. “Mutant” is a term derived from Darwinism, which Jews and homosexuals use as a weapon to attack morality, one of the most significant manifestations of *logos* in human life.

If homo sapiens is part of nature, then morality is part of nature as well because morality is the manifestation of *logos* which Immanuel Kant called “practical reason.” Pure reason allows the mind to apprehend what is true; practical reason allows man to achieve the good. The man who achieves the good is happy. Therefore, morality is essential to human happiness:

“Morality is not about what the world is like, but about what the world ought to be like; it is not a matter of description but prescription.”^[66] Morality, which guarantees the rationality of human action, also determines whether human acts bring about freedom for the human subject. This explains why Jewish Darwinism is so determined to undermine morality by claiming that it has non-human origin in the animal world. People like Harari dispute man’s rationality because they want to undermine his freedom, which only exists if he acts in conformity to reason. Morality is also the only protection which man has against the rule of *Libido Dominandi*, which is the operating system of every world empire. The American Empire differs from its predecessors only in the sophistication of its forms of control. Because of their expertise in moral subversion, the Jews play a crucial role in administering the American Empire’s system of control through “liberation,” which invariably means liberation from the moral law, which invariably means slavery for any rational creature. When sociobiologists like Richard Dawkins “use their ‘magic wand’ of natural selection to explain [*i.e.* undermine] moral behavior,” they are collaborating in the Empire’s system of political control by depriving man of any possible ground for objecting to their schemes. When right and wrong become the opinions of the powerful, those who lack political power have no way to formulate their objections, much less implement them. When Dawkins makes human behavior a function of “selfish genes,” he appeals to the guilty conscience of those who are burdened their own transgressions of the moral law by absolving them of responsibility. But in giving them absolution, Dawkins lures them into a trap from which there is no escape. Those who have abandoned the moral law to justify their sexual sins cannot suddenly do an about face and appeal to the same moral law to object to their economic subjugation. No, they have been caught in the trap of materialism which professors like Dawkins and Harari have prepared for them. Harari promotes materialism, rather than *logos*, because materialism is a form of control and *logos* is its opposite. In spite of what he says, Harari knows that the

key to understanding humans and their moral beliefs ... will not be found in something material, such as genes, but in something immaterial, the mind. Morality comes from the immaterial mind, not from the material brain or genome. The brain is governed by laws of physics, chemistry, and biology, but thoughts and beliefs are not. It should not surprise us then that people have known the contents of their own minds from time immemorial without knowing

anything about brains and genes. They knew also about morality without knowing anything about brains and genes. Claiming differently reduces the working of the mind to the materialism of the brain. That is basically what Charles Darwin said in an early private notebook, “Why is thought, being a secretion of brain, more wonderful than gravity as a property of matter?”^[67]

“Modern science,” Harari tells us dogmatically, “has no dogma.”^[68] Coming from a man who believes that “atoms formed,” as well as in the existence of the missing link, and who feels that he has knowledge of the most intimate details of the sex lives of cave men, this proposition is nothing short of preposterous. He gets closer to the point when he tells us:

Scientists have provided the imperial project with practical knowledge, ideological justification and technological gadgets. Without this contribution it is highly questionable whether Europeans could have conquered the world.^[69]

Science is, in other words, a form of control primarily because it has become a replacement for “dogmas” like the moral law. Why are Jews like Harari so interested in overturning the moral law? First of all because they are at war with *logos*. Secondly, because they are interested in control. Jews are always a minority, which means that they need an instrument to project their power over the majority. Empire has always been congenial to the projection of Jewish power. “It goes without saying,” Harari tells us, “that the political, economic and social practices of modern Jews, for example, owe far more to the empires under which they lived during the past two millennia than to the traditions of the ancient kingdom of Judaea.”^[70] Jews have been able to thrive in empires throughout history because they are good at administering those empires’ systems of control. The American Empire is no exception to this rule. If the broad sweep of history has any direction in Harari’s view it is that successive empires have unified more and more territory under their hegemony, culminating finally in the American Empire, as administered by Jews like Professor Harari, who claims that the American Empire is founded on science and capitalism. Darwinism plays a crucial role in the administration of the American Empire because it uses “science” to rule out of court any moral objection to the economic exploitation that is an intrinsic part of the oligarchic system known as capitalism. Control means, in the first instance, decertifying any and all forms of *logos* or rationality which restrict the power of the oligarchs. Harari couches this concept in the language of science and progress but the meaning is the same: “One of the things that has made it possible for modern social orders to hold together is the spread of an

almost religious belief in technology and in the methods of scientific research, which have replaced to some extent the belief in absolute truths.”^[71] This means that the Jews who have been at war with *logos* for the past two millennia will have a natural advantage in rising to the top of an empire which is based on *Libido Dominandi* and the intellectual decertification of any challenge to oligarchic hegemony. Control, in other words, becomes the Rosetta Stone which unlocks the meaning of the contradictions which litter his book from beginning to end.

Biological Determinism

Because Professor Harari has abandoned reason in favor of biological determinism as the front for *Libido Dominandi*, it is not surprising that his reasoning is flawed or that his narrative is plagued by one contradiction after another. Shortly after telling us that everything human is natural, *i.e.*, a function of biology, Professor Harari switches horses in mid-stream and tells us that nothing is natural. It turns out that one of the main things we associate with biology, namely, differentiation according to sex, is a “product of the imagination, like the caste system in India and the racial system in America.” It is not a “natural division with deep biological roots.”^[72]

Just when we thought that Harari was a biological determinist, it turns out that he believes that biology is a social construct too. Anyone, he tells us, who believes that “relations between two people of the opposite sex are natural and between two people of the same sex unnatural” is not in touch with “biological reality” but is rather suffering from “cultural bias,”^[73] unlike homosexuals, who are constitutionally incapable of suffering from any cultural bias whatsoever. It turns out that when it comes to sex, all biological bets are off. To make his point Harari even invokes “Mother Nature,” who—unsurprisingly, given Harari’s sexual orientation, “does not mind if men are sexually attracted to one another. It’s only human mothers and fathers steeped in particular cultures who make a scene if their son has a fling with the boy next door.”^[74]

If there is no such thing as “unnatural” behavior when it comes to sex, then biology has become a fiction too, along with morality and religion. Biology, in other words, ceases to be real the moment it is used to defend a stable order of being which the oligarchs and their lackeys find uncongenial. Professor Harari has finally made contact with the ontological realm only to deny its existence. When it comes to sex, the “imaginary” is more real than the biological. When it comes to religion we have the exact opposite situation. Religion is a purely imaginary *ignis fatuus* hovering over the marsh of biological determinism. When it comes to sexual differentiation, nature

has no meaning at all. Which is it, professor? Harari's a Darwinist, which is to say a biological materialist, when it comes to religion. But he's a Foucauldian when it comes to biology, especially when it comes to sexual differentiation, which it turns out is completely imaginary, just like religion, and a purely cultural construct. The best explanation for this contradiction is Harari's guilty conscience. But that is not the only explanation. The other explanation is political control. The ultimate determination about whether an idea is "real" or not depends on whether it can be used as a form of control. Biology, as a result, gets discarded the minute someone makes use of it to defend a stable order of being, as manifested in differentiation by sex. Darwinism is a system of control which is effective because it denies the reality of any stable being. If everything is in flux, there is no such thing as justice and no way to object to an unjust social order. Not surprisingly, Harari titles Chapter 8 of his book "There is no Justice in History."

Instead of just leaving it at that and telling us that might makes right, Harari attempts to justify his elimination of justice from history by distinguishing "what is biologically determined from what people merely try to justify through biological myths" by claiming that "a good rule of thumb is 'Biology enables, Culture forbids.'" ^[75] Culture, he continues, "tends to argue that it forbids only that which is unnatural. But from a biological perspective, nothing is unnatural. Whatever is possible is by definition also natural. A truly unnatural behaviour, one that goes against the laws of nature, simply cannot exist, so it would need no prohibition." ^[76] According to Harari's definition, culture is the only thing that is unnatural, and this is so because "in truth, our concepts 'natural' and 'unnatural' are taken not from biology, but from Christian theology." ^[77]

Truth

It's reassuring to know that Professor Harari believes in the truth, even if he uses the phrase to promote what is obviously false, but is it true to say that differentiation according to sex is not part of the biological or natural world? That would be hard to maintain. What Harari is really telling us is that he is the self-appointed, undisputed commissar of all meanings when it comes to biology. Anyone who insists that male and female have a meaning which our homosexual professor does not like gets ruled out of court immediately by being associated with "Christian theology," which is an insult if you're a Jew.

In doing this, Professor Harari strains our credulity, and endangers thereby his own role as a successful commissar for the American Darwinist Empire of political control through state-managed appetite. The entire edifice of imperial control is based on one non-existent premise, namely, the unprovable non-existence of God.

The theological meaning of 'natural' is 'in accordance with the intentions of the God who created nature'. Christian theologians argued that God created the human body, intending each limb and organ to serve a particular purpose. ... If we use our limbs and organs for the purpose envisioned by God, then it is a natural activity. To use them differently than God intends is unnatural. But evolution has no purpose. Organs have not evolved with a purpose, and the way they are used is in constant flux.^[78]

We agree completely with what Harari had to say about God and purpose in nature, but Harari is so intent on disproving "Christian theology" that he failed to see that he undermined the fundamental tenet of natural selection when he told us that "organs have not evolved with a purpose." Isn't success in the struggle for survival the whole point of natural selection? Doesn't that qualify as purpose? Isn't that the purpose at the heart of the idea of survival of the fittest? Isn't survival a purpose? Isn't that why an organism with sharper eyes wins out over one which can't see as well? Does the eye have no purpose? Does the eye see? Does the ear hear? Does the nose detect odors? Does the wing enable flight? Everywhere we look in nature we see purpose. The purpose of the lion is to catch the deer. If we are Darwinists, we

see natural selection aiding the purposeful behavior of some organisms over others, unless we are blinded, as Professor Harari is, by a Jewish animus toward Christianity and a homosexual animus against Nature. At this point, I can imagine Darwin, if not rolling over in his grave, then certainly rolling his eyes and feeling vindicated in his belief that the Anglo-Saxons race was intellectually superior to the Semitic.

“Scientists studying the inner workings of the human organism,” Harari informs us at another point,

have found no soul there. They increasingly argue that human behaviour is determined by hormones, genes and synapses, rather than by free will—the same forces that determine the behaviour of chimpanzees, wolves, and ants. Our judicial and political systems largely try to sweep such inconvenient discoveries under the carpet. But in all frankness, how long can we maintain the wall separating the department of biology from the departments of law and political science?^[79]

As we have already shown, there is no separation. “Biology,” as interpreted by the professors of Darwinism, has been given the force of law in a system of complete control. All objections based on *logos* are ruled out of court by this ideological system. All religious and moral claims are debunked as unreal by an appeal to “biology,” which is to say biological determinism. Yet any appeal to biology as proof that sexual differentiation is part of nature gets debunked by the claim that all sex roles are culturally created. It’s heads I win, tails you lose. Or as Professor Harari puts it: “myths, rather than biology, define the roles, rights and duties of men and women.”^[80] Words mean what the professor wants them to mean.

Harari’s book is not so much a history as a celebration, as he puts it, of “The Marriage of Science and Empire,” which united to create the operating system of the American Empire. Jews like Harari play a crucial role in bringing the two together by giving us a reading of *Wealth of Nations*, “the most important economics manifesto of all time,”^[81] which sounds as if it had been cribbed from the writings of Murray Rothbard:

In this view, the wisest economic policy is to keep politics out of the economy, reduce taxation and government regulation to a minimum, and allow market forces free rein to take their course. Private investors, unencumbered by political considerations, will invest their money where they can get the most profit, so the way to ensure the most economic growth—which will benefit everyone, industrialists and workers—is for the government to do as little as possible. This free-market doctrine is today the most common and influential

variant of the capitalist creed.^[82]

Adam Smith, as a result, comes off sounding a lot like Gordon Gecko. “What Smith says,” Harari tells us, as if letting us in on the inside story, “is, in fact, that greed is good.”^[83]

Heaven on Earth

According to Professor Harari, the combination of science and capitalism is going to lead to heaven on earth. Jews always promise heaven on earth and then deliver the opposite as soon as they get their hands on the reins of political power. Bolshevism in Russia is one example. Zionism in Palestine is another. The Neoconservative End of History, which followed on the heels of Communism's collapse, is still another. Professor Harari is no exception to this rule. "Paradise," he tells us toward the end of his book, "is right around the corner."^[84] All we need is "more patience" and docility to Professor Harari's utopian view of the world in order to get there. And what does this paradise look like? Well, it looks a lot like New York City, capital of the American Empire, where: "The new ethic promises paradise on condition that the rich remain greedy and spend their time making more money, and that the masses give free rein to their cravings and passions—and buy more and more."^[85] But there are other reasons.

Paradise is just around the corner because for "the first time in history ... the world is dominated by a peace-loving elite—politicians, business people, intellectuals and artists who genuinely see war as both evil and avoidable."^[86] We know that Barack Obama won the Nobel Peace Prize while simultaneously conducting seven wars in the Middle East. Professor Harari unfortunately failed to give us the names of the individuals who make up this "peace-loving elite," which is a shame because we would surely like to know who they are, if for no other reason than out of a desire to follow their instructions more faithfully, so that we can hasten our arrival in "paradise." But the implication is clear. It is the same group which tried to create heaven on earth in the past: Simon bar Kochba, Shabbetai Zevi, Karl Marx, Theodore Herzl, Lev Trotsky, Irving Kristol, David Brooks, David Frum—in short, the *Tikkun Olam* crowd. It turns out that the one thing the members of this "peace-loving elite" has in common, from the Zealots at the time of Christ to the Neocon Chickenhawks who got us into the current morass in the Middle East, was their love of what Trotsky called "perpetual war."

Be that as it may, Professor Harari has very definite ideas about the Jewish paradise that he and his friends are preparing for us. The End of History corresponds to the arrival of the perfect social order, which is based on capitalism and science, which tell us that:

As far as we can tell, from a purely scientific viewpoint, human life has absolutely no meaning. [Is the preceding sentence a meaningful statement?] Humans are the outcome of blind evolutionary processes that operate without goal or purpose. Our actions are not part of some divine cosmic plan, and if planet Earth were to blow up tomorrow morning, the universe would probably keep going about its business as usual. As far as we can tell at this point, human subjectivity would not be missed. Hence any meaning that people ascribe to their lives is just a delusion. The other-worldly meanings medieval people found in their lives were no more deluded than the modern humanist, nationalist and capitalist meanings modern people find.^[87]

Hence it should come as no surprise to learn that the goal of history as manifested by the American Empire and administered by Jews like Harari, is not the happiness of its inhabitants:

the dynamics of history are not directed towards enhancing human well-being. There is no basis for thinking that the most successful cultures in history are necessarily the best ones for Homo sapiens. Like evolution, history disregards the happiness of individual organisms.^[88]

This is not reason for despair, however, because happiness is still possible even if “life has absolutely no meaning” because:

Biologists hold that our mental and emotional world is governed by biochemical mechanisms shaped by millions of years of evolution. Like all other mental states, our subjective well-being is not determined by external parameters such as salary, social relations or political rights. Rather, it is determined by a complex system of nerves, neurons, synapses and various biochemical substances such as serotonin, dopamine and oxytocin.^[89]

It turns out that history has a meaning after all, and that the ultimate meaning is pharmaceutical:

If we accept the biological approach to happiness, then history turns out to be of minor importance, since most historical events have had no impact on our biochemistry. History can change the external stimuli that cause serotonin to be secreted, yet it does not change the resulting serotonin levels, and hence it cannot make people happier.^[90]

If “the only thing that matters” is the level of serotonin in my blood,^[91] why did I waste my time reading Harari’s book? Was it only to learn that:

There is only one historical development that has real significance. Today,

when we finally realise that the keys to happiness are in the hands of our biochemical system, we can stop wasting our time on politics and social reforms, putsches and ideologies, and focus instead on the only thing that can make us truly happy: manipulating our biochemistry.^[92]

After wasting our time by slogging through 400 pages of illogicality couched in bad prose, we learn to our chagrin that history is bunk, and true happiness lies in ingesting the right chemicals. The same Jews who used to promote revolution are now promoting a docile drugged out population, probably because the Jews are now in control and want to remain there. Turning Karl Marx upside down, Professor Harari feels that opiates should be the religion of the masses:

If we invest billions in understanding our brain chemistry and developing appropriate treatments, we can make people far happier than ever before, without any need of revolutions. Prozac, for example, does not change regimes, but by raising serotonin levels it lifts people out of their depression. Nothing captures the biological argument better than the famous New Age slogan: ‘Happiness Begins Within.’ Money, social status, plastic surgery, beautiful houses, powerful positions—none of these will bring you happiness. Lasting happiness comes only from serotonin, dopamine and oxytocin.^[93]

Or did he mean OxyContin? According to Harari, “each day, each person” should take “a dose of ‘soma’, a synthetic drug which makes people happy without harming their productivity and efficiency.”^[94] Aldous Huxley popularized the originally Indian concept of “Soma” as a form of control in his dystopian novel *Brave New World*, which appeared in 1932. The Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitor which goes by the brand name of Prozac entered medical use in 1986.^[95] Soma in its current form came on the market in 1995 and is known as OxyContin. OxyContin—which is the time-release version of Oxycodone, an opiate which has been in existence since 1916—is a Jewish invention. It was created by the Sackler family and marketed by their drug firm Purdue Pharma. In 2007, Purdue Pharma had to pay a \$600 million fine for “lying to doctors about the potential for patients to abuse OxyContin”^[96] and thereby almost single-handedly igniting what is now being called the opioid crisis. The \$600 million Purdue Pharma paid was a drop in the bucket compared to the billions OxyContin has earned for it since the drug was first approved by the FDA. The Sackler family alone has a net worth of \$13 billion, which places them above the Rockefellers and the Mellons on the list of America’s richest families.^[97]

Purdue Pharma's founder Arthur Sackler along with his brothers grew up in Brooklyn during the Depression as the child of Jewish immigrants from Galicia and Poland. His genius lay not so much in the chemistry of the brain as in the chemistry of modern advertising. "In 1997, Arthur was posthumously inducted into the Medical Advertising Hall of Fame, and a citation praised his achievement in 'bringing the full power of advertising and promotion to pharmaceutical marketing.'" Sackler was, in other words, a drug dealer who knew how to change the system to accommodate what was previously known as either unethical or illegal activity. In this, he was no different from other Jews of his generation—like Meyer Lansky or Moe Dalitz, for instance—who accomplished the same feat by bringing about the decriminalization of gambling and usury.

The Sackler family epitomizes in our day the perfect marriage of science and capitalism which Hariri celebrates in *Sapiens*. Like the English involvement in the opium trade in the 19th century, Arthur Sackler provided the imperial project with practical knowledge, ideological justification, and pharmaceutical gadgets which turned Americans into Harari's idea of the ideal citizen, which is to say, into a mass of drugged out zombies who made the Jews rich by becoming their docile chemical slaves. Without the collaboration of the Jewish pharmaceutical industry, "it is highly questionable whether Europeans [*i.e.*, the Anglo-American empire] could have conquered the world."^[98]

Super-Oxycontin

When the original patent for OxyContin was about to expire in the 1980s, the “scientists” at Purdue came up with a dose that was eight times stronger than the original pill, creating the equivalent of “an nuclear weapon ... in terms of narcotic firepower.”^[99] Soon the same people who had gotten hooked on the drug were grinding up multiple tablets of the new super-OxyContin and injecting it into their veins to maintain the original high, which had worn off as original highs always do. Graduating to the needle meant that those who began their addiction to OxyContin under a doctor’s supervision for things like athletic injuries soon moved on to heroin, which at a certain point became cheaper than the drug Purdue Pharma was peddling.

Within five years of its release in 1995, OxyContin was earning Purdue Pharma \$1 billion a year. During this time

there were signs that people were abusing it in rural areas like Maine and Appalachia. If you ground the pills up and snorted them, or dissolved them in liquid and injected them, you could override the time-release mechanism and deliver a huge narcotic payload all at once. ... As more and more doctors prescribed OxyContin for an ever-greater range of symptoms, some patients began selling their pills on the black market, where the street price was a dollar a milligram. Doctors who were easily manipulated by their patients—or corrupted by the money in play—set up so-called pill mills, pain clinics that thrived on a wholesale business of issuing OxyContin prescriptions.^[100]

The Sackler family’s \$13 billion net worth was accumulated from a load of human suffering and death which is only now coming to light:

Since 1999, two hundred thousand Americans have died from overdoses related to OxyContin and other prescription opioids. Many addicts, finding prescription painkillers too expensive or too difficult to obtain, have turned to heroin. According to the American Society of Addiction Medicine, four out of five people who try heroin today started with prescription painkillers. The most recent figures from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention suggest that a hundred and forty-five Americans now die every day from opioid overdoses.^[101]

In Pike County, Kentucky, where Purdue Pharma reached an out of court settlement, 29 percent of the county’s residents said that they or their families

knew someone who had died as a result of using OxyContin. At the time of the lawsuit, nearly half of the players on the 1997 Pikeville High School football team “had died of overdoses or were addicted.” In some parts of West Virginia ten percent of newborns come into this world addicted to opioids.

The story of the Sackler family gives new meaning to Harari’s celebration of drugs as the “only” source of “lasting happiness.”^[102] It also puts in stark relief the difference between the Jewish heaven on earth based on Darwinism, “science,” *Libido Dominandi*, and dope and St. Augustine’s *City of God*. We now have a clear idea of the slavery which Harari’s Jewish utopia entails. Can anyone in his right mind choose that over a social order based on *logos* as articulated by the tradition of the natural law which was abandoned at around the time of the Scientific Revolution? According to that concept

moral laws are based on human nature, on the way we are. As a consequence, morality is a function of human nature, so that reason can discover valid moral principles by looking at the nature of humanity and society, no matter where on Earth. This means that what we ought to do is related to what we are. “You shall not kill,” for instance, is based on the real value of human life and the need to preserve it. “You shall not commit adultery” is based on the real value of marriage.^[103]

There is, in other words, no radical dichotomy between the mind and the universe. *Logos* is common to both, or as Aquinas would say, “the light of reason is placed by nature in every man to guide him in his acts.” This means that

the laws of morality are not rules that we invent but principles that we discover, similar in a way to the laws of a science such as physiology. Just as our physiological nature makes it necessary for us to eat certain foods and to breathe oxygen for our bodies to be healthy, so our moral nature makes certain moral rules and laws necessary for our souls to be healthy. Not only is there a physical order in nature, but also a moral order.^[104]

The order of creation is eminently rational. True science could not exist if it were not. Science and mathematics are not possible in the Darwinian universe which Professor Harari is proposing as “paradise.” They are only possible if we accept the proposition that:

The most fundamental assumption of the rational mind is that the world perceived through reason is true—that the world itself is reasonable. This presupposes that the mind interpreting the world through reason is somehow

apprehending the world as it actually exists.^[105]

The “mysterious conformity here between the rationality of our minds and the ‘rationality’ found in the world around us” has a very simple explanation: both were brought into being by “an intelligent, rational, orderly, and lawgiving Creator God who made this Universe the way it is.”^[106]

Creation could not exist without a Creator. Creation is rational because the Creator is the epitome of all rationality. God is *logos* and *logos* is God. The mind of man fits into that order like a key into a lock:

Only the existence of God can explain that there is a Universe, that there is order in this Universe, that this Universe is intelligible, that there are universal laws of nature, and that there are universal moral laws. This is the only way we can take the world as something created according to an intelligible plan accessible to the human intellect through the natural light of reason. This is the only way we can understand the natural order and moral order of this Universe. Because there is a Creator, we have not only a rational Lawgiver—who guarantees order, intelligibility, and predictability—but also a moral Lawgiver—who guarantees decency, integrity, conscience, responsibility, justice, and human dignity that comes with human rights.^[107]

In spite of his allegiance to Darwin, philosophical materialism, dope, and even dopier “science,” Professor Harari can’t seem to get Genesis out of his mind. He ends his book not as the disinterested scientist but by taking on the role of the Serpent in the Garden of Eden, who told Eve “ye shall be like gods” if she and her husband followed his instructions. Harari titles the afterword to his book: “the animal that became a god,” arguing that man can become divine by following what Harari calls “intelligent design.”

Animal to God

Like the United States of America, which went from barbarism to decadence without ever finding civilization along the way, Harari's Sapiens went from being an animal to a god without ever becoming human. Which vision is more plausible? The idea that man evolved from an amoeba into a god, or the claim that "At the dawn of humanity, there appeared quite suddenly and abruptly the faculties of language, rationality, morality, self-awareness, and religion, all combined in an immortal soul—practically all at once."^[108]

By now it should be obvious that what Harari calls intelligent design is another word for *logos*. The event that he predicts for the future actually happened 70,000 years ago. It is now time for Sapiens to abandon the illusions of the Serpent and return to being what he has been all along, the rational animal who occupies an intermediary position between angels and beasts.

Endnotes

- [1] Christopher Dawson, *Dynamics of World History* (Wilmington, DE: ISI, 2002), p. 303.
- [2] Dawson, p. 305.
- [3] Dawson, p. 305.
- [4] <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/7477-hegel-georg-wilhelm-friedrich>
- [5] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Herbert_Butterfield
- [6] <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/158386-the-ideas-of-economists-and-political-philosophers-both-when-they>
- [7] Yuval Noah Harari, *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind* (New York: HarperCollins, 2015), Kindle file, p. 3.
- [8] Harari, p. 3.
- [9] Gerard Verschuuren, *At the Dawn of Humanity: The First Humans*, to be published in 2018, p. 12.
- [10] Verschuuren, p. 30.
- [11] Harari, p. 27.
- [12] Harari, p. 28.
- [13] Harari, p. 32.
- [14] Harari, p. 27.
- [15] Verschuuren, p. 113.
- [16] Harari, p. 37.
- [17] Harari, p. 37.
- [18] Harari, p. 109.
- [19] Harari, pp. 109-19.
- [20] Harari, p. 110.
- [21] Harari, p. 111.
- [22] Harari, p. 108.
- [23] Harari, p. 108.
- [24] Harari, p. 109.
- [25] An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon founded upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889), *logos*, pp. 476-7.
- [26] Harari, p. 4.

- [27] Harari, p. 5.
- [28] Verschuuren, p. 51.
- [29] Harari, p. 19.
- [30] Harari, p. 21.
- [31] Verschuuren, p. 65.
- [32] Harari, p. 22.
- [33] Harari, p. 22.
- [34] Harari, p. 22.
- [35] Harari, p. 22.
- [36] <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/01/science/01chimp.html>
- [37] <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/01/science/01chimp.html>
- [38] Verschuuren, p. 43.
- [39] Verschuuren, pp. 43-4.
- [40] Verschuuren, p. 46.
- [41] Verschuuren, p. 52.
- [42] Verschuuren, p. 57.
- [43] Verschuuren, p. 64.
- [44] Verschuuren, p. 80.
- [45] Verschuuren, p. 190.
- [46] Verschuuren, p. 194.
- [47] Verschuuren, p. 194.
- [48] Verschuuren, p. 191.
- [49] Verschuuren, p. 192.
- [50] Verschuuren, p. 191.
- [51] Verschuuren, p. 196.
- [52] Verschuuren, pp. 197-8.
- [53] Harari, p. 24.
- [54] Harari, p. 24.
- [55] Harari, p. 41.
- [56] Harari, p. 41.
- [57] Harari, p. 41.
- [58] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Embryology>
- [59] Harari, p. 42.

- [60] Harari, p. 22.
- [61] Harari, p. 22.
- [62] Harari, p. 24.
- [63] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yuval_Noah_Harari
- [64] See chapter one of my book *Degenerate Moderns* for more details.
- [65] Again, see *Degenerate Moderns* for details.
- [66] Verschuuren, p. 99.
- [67] Verschuuren, p. 114.
- [68] Harari, p. 254.
- [69] Harari, p. 304.
- [70] Harari, p. 192.
- [71] Harari, p. 254.
- [72] Harari, p. 145.
- [73] Harari, p. 146.
- [74] Harari, p. 146.
- [75] Harari, p. 146.
- [76] Harari, p. 147.
- [77] Harari, p. 147.
- [78] Harari, p. 147.
- [79] Harari, p. 236.
- [80] Harari, p. 149.
- [81] Harari, p. 311.
- [82] Harari, p. 328.
- [83] Harari, p. 311.
- [84] Harari, p. 333.
- [85] Harari, p. 349.
- [86] Harari, p. 374.
- [87] Harari, p. 391.
- [88] Harari, p. 243.
- [89] Harari, p. 386.
- [90] Harari, p. 388.
- [91] Harari, p. 389.
- [92] Harari, p. 389.

[93] Harari, p. 389.

[94] Harari, p. 390.

[95] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fluoxetine>

[96] <https://forward.com/fast-forward/385375/the-jewish-family-making-billions-from-the-opioid-crisis/>

[97] <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/10/30/the-family-that-built-an-empire-of-pain>

[98] Harari, p. 304.

[99] <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/10/30/the-family-that-built-an-empire-of-pain>

[100] <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/10/30/the-family-that-built-an-empire-of-pain>

[101] <https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/10/30/the-family-that-built-an-empire-of-pain>

[102] Harari, p. 389.

[103] Verschuuren, p. 118.

[104] Verschuuren, p. 134.

[105] Verschuuren, p. 179.

[106] Verschuuren, pp. 157-9.

[107] Verschuuren, p. 165.

[108] Verschuuren, p. 200.